

LIST OF NEW PATENTS RELATING TO ARCHITECTURE, ENGINEERING, &c., GRANTED FOR ENGLAND.

Furnished by Mr. A. Prince, of the Office for Patents of Inventions, Lincoln's-Inn Fields.

[SIX MONTHS FOR ENROLMENT.]

William Robinson Mulley, and George Mason, jun., of Ipswich, contractors, for improvements in collecting and raising stone or substances from below water. April 2.

Otis Tufts, of Boston, in the state of Massachusetts, America, engineer, for a certain new and useful mode of building or constructing either the hulls or decks, or hulls, as the case may require, of ships, boats, and various other sailing or floating vessels made of iron, or other suitable metal or metals. April 2.

John Dewrance, of Liverpool, engineer, for certain improvements in steam boilers, and in the construction, composition, and manufacture of bearings, steps, and other rubbing surfaces of steam engines and other machinery, and also for a method of lubricating the same. April 7.

Thomas Metcalfe, of Elizabeth-street, Eaton-square, brush-maker, for certain improvements in propelling carriages, which improvements are also applicable to driving certain machinery. April 7.

James Lamb Hancock, Frederick Augustus Lamb Hancock, and William Lamb Hancock, of Guildsfield, Montgomery, for an improved rotary steam engine. April 7.

Edward Bury, of Hanslope, Buckinghamshire, civil engineer, for certain improvements in locomotive engines, carriages, or wagons running upon railways or common roads, for the prevention of accidents. April 7.

Elijah Galloway, of the Strand, engineer, for improvements in propelling railway carriages. April 9.

Samuel Stocker, of Canonbury-place, engineer, for improvements in machinery or apparatus for lifting, forcing, or conveying liquids in vessels, for holding liquids, and improvements in water-closets. April 9.

John Coope Haddan, of Liverpool-street, King's-cross, Middlesex, engineer, for improvements in preparing sleepers, chairs, and spikes, and constructing wheels for railways. April 14.

Frederick Rosenborg, of Kingston-upon-Hull, gentleman, for certain improvements in machinery for cutting and shaping wood and other materials into various forms or figures, and also for cleaning and smoothing the surfaces of the same forms or figures. April 15.

George Carter, of Willenhall, Stafford, jobbing smith, for certain improvements in locks and latches. April 15.

John Lord, of Friday-bridge, Birmingham, merchant, for improvements in supplying steam-boilers with water. April 15.

George Royle, of Church-hill, Wednesbury, Stafford, whitewash, for improvements in locomotive, marine, steam, gas, and other tubes. April 17.

William Mackie, of Baginot-street, Dublin, builder, for improvements in window-sashes and shutters. April 22.

Freeman Roe, of the Strand, engineer, for improvements in the manufacture of pipes for conveying water and other fluids. April 22.

Joseph Maudslay, and Joshua Field, of Lambeth, engineers, for certain improvements in propelling, and propelling machinery. April 24.

Robert Beart, of Godmanchester, gentleman, for improvements in the manufacture of bricks and tiles. April 24.

Samuel Wilkes, of Wolverhampton, iron-founder, for improvements in the manufacture of hinges. April 26.

John Sylvestre, of Great Russell-street, Bloomsbury, civil engineer, for improvements in stoves and fire-places. April 29.

Gilmour Wilson, of Earl-street, London, engineer, for improvements in the construction of wheels for carriages. April 29.

Frederic Leonard, of Kepple-street, engineer, for improvements in generating steam and evaporating liquids. April 29.

James Nasmyth, of Arundel-street, gentleman, for certain improvements in engines or machines for obtaining and applying motive power. April 29.

Correspondence.

ARCHITECTURAL MODELLERS.

SIR,—Your correspondent who writes on architectural modelling at page 190 of your excellent periodical seems to entertain a mistaken and somewhat prejudiced feeling towards architects, builders, and plasterers, which I shall endeavour to correct.

Your subscriber states: "In almost all cases the modeller is not employed by the architect, but by the builder, who, having little taste for works of art himself, employs any body he can get to do it cheap, mostly some plasterer, who understands little about modelling, nothing about drawing or style of composition, while the artist of acknowledged talent is entirely deserted by the architect."

In reference to the above remarks, I shall admit that the decorative modeller is seldom directly employed by the architect; but instead of being employed by the builder, it much more frequently occurs that he is engaged by the plasterer, as was the case at Buckingham Palace, Windsor Castle, York House, &c., where architectural modelling was carried out to an extent of beauty and magnificence, if not unequalled, at least unsurpassed, and that too, under the immediate guidance of a plasterer, whose name will go down to posterity as the greatest man in the line ever produced in England.

Your correspondent also (with all due deference to his talents) evidently writes on a subject he does not quite understand when he states, that "the drawing made by the architect seldom for more than a quarter part, gives a very ambiguous idea of the subject wanted, and in many cases no drawing at all; the models on made are consigned to the tender mercies of some *hod boy* to cast, and to fix by others who know as little about it."

Surely, Mr. Editor, your decorative modeller is sadly out of his latitude in the above assertion. Firstly, are we to understand him that in some cases the architect makes no drawing at all? If so, pray what is the architect's office? Secondly, there is not such a class of individuals in London, or elsewhere as "*hod boys*." I presume your correspondent or your printer's devil has made a mistake, for this should have been "*odd boys*;" and certainly odd lads they are some of them, and clever fellows too; really boys of intrinsic value, some of them bright young geniuses of the very first magnitude. I have had many of these same lads in cast my enrichments, and when properly trained, they do it in the most expert manner; their proper cognomen is "*hawk boys*." Thirdly, the decorations after being modelled and cast are in all good establishments fixed by expert plasterers, picked men, masters in their particular branch; and, lastly, to wind up this statement, and to show that your subscriber is labouring under a delusion, I have to add that the very best architectural modeller, as regards minuteness of detail, &c., served his time to be "a plasterer" with the late Mr. Geo. Robson of Durham, never had an hour's instruction in drawing, and has immortalized his name in the annals of modelling by his copies of various sizes from the remains of the Temple of Jupiter Stator, &c. Need I name the justly celebrated "Tom Gillespie." Further, the very best general modeller and designer ever known in London was originally a "*hawk boy*;" and again, the best men in the line practising at the present day, have more or less originated from the plasterer and the hawk boy. If I have been somewhat ungentle in my remarks, and indulged in a touch of pleasantry in this matter, I trust your correspondent will forgive me, my observations being well meant, and originating in the wish to set both him and the public right, for I merely lifted the pen to correct his erroneous conclusions, and to defend the architects, builders, and plasterers, from imputations they do not deserve; the former of whom, instead of deserting talents and genius when they see them developed, invariably encourage them to the fullest extent. The fault does not rest with the architect, as your writer supposes, but in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, with the modellers themselves, some of whom possessing talents of the very first order, are unhappily too much given to gaiety and midnight carousals, instead of attending to the instructions of their patrons the architects. Others, again, do not possess those peculiar abilities requisite to carry out

the ideas of the architect, and consequently are rejected. So ends my present theme, and if he and the public will not assent to its truth, why verily they are dissenters worse than pagans, as Fraser or some of his writers would have said, and consequently not entitled to consideration.—I am, Sir, &c.,

FRANK TYRRELL.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

SKETCHING INTERDICTED IN CATHEDRALS, &c.

SIR,—Pray enter a protest in your influential journal against the exclusive system of preventing architects and others sketching in cathedrals, churches, &c. To-day, seeing some excellent bosses in the Lady Chapel at St. Saviour's, and being of course anxious to sketch, I was told, as usual, "No sketching is allowed, Sir, without a permission from the warden," which, having only an hour or so to spare, was not to be obtained. It is the case all over this country—at Canterbury, Hereford, Westminster Abbey, and wherever I have been,—Durham is the only honourable exception, and I do not think that the cathedral has suffered for this unusual liberality. In France, I have sketched, measured, and studied in the cathedrals without any hindrance; whatever, and I think that you will agree with me, that it ought to be the case here. If you will make this a subject of consideration, and notice it in your paper, you will much oblige, Sir,

Your obedient servant,
A SUBSCRIBER.

•• We fully agree with our correspondent, that such prohibition, where it exists, is unwarrantable and vexatious, and will gladly lend our assistance to induce the discontinuance of it.—Ed.

COVERING FOR ROOFS.

SIR,—I shall be glad if some one of your correspondents will give me some information respecting a really good and light material for roofing, in a climate such as that of America. Zinc I am fearful of, as the heat of the sun draws it out of shape, and wherever there is much condensed smoke or soot settling upon it, it corrodes most provokingly. The buildings I wish to roof are in one story; they are built of wood, and the roofs are wanted a good span, say 50 feet. I have heard of galvanized iron, but wish to hear how those who have tried it find it to answer, and the expense per square foot. Any of your correspondents able to furnish me with this information will confer a great favour by doing so.

I am, Sir, &c.,
A SUBSCRIBER.

ESTIMATES FOR HOTEL AT WHITEHAVEN.

SIR,—My attention having been drawn to a letter in THE BUILDER of last week, professing to give information respecting the tenders for the proposed hotel at Whitehaven, I have to observe that it is not my practice to supply quantities on any occasion, and with reference to the business in question, that the quantities were abstracted by Mr. John Blyth on my behalf, as architect, and by Mr. Epps on the part of the builders.

I shall be obliged by the insertion of this letter, and remain, Sir, your obedient servant,
R. C. GARDENIER.

Guildford-street, Russell-square,
May 12th, 1845.

HAGIOSCOPE IN EARLY CHURCHES.

SIR,—In "THE BUILDER" of the 10th inst. I find inserted a very interesting account, historical and architectural, of Alderton Church, Wilts. The writer refers, at some length, to a very curious "hagioscope" in the said church, and inclines to the opinion, which he quotes from the Cambridge Camden Society, that such openings were found in early Norman churches.

In a late charge of the Venerable Archdeacon Shirley, I find the early origin of these architectural features of a church questioned. Would you, or any of your readers, have the goodness to mention any instances of "hagioscopes" of undoubted early character. I much question if there were any in Norman times.

I am, Sir, &c.,
J. F.